

**Barman, Mike**

---

**From:** Barman, Mike  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 03, 2003 12:06 PM  
**To:** Miller, Katherine - DOT  
**Subject:** FW: Fiscal Estimate for LRB 03-3446/2

*I ran your problem by my supervisor ... here is what she came up with (see below). I hope this answers your question.*

*Mike Barman*

Mike Barman - Senior Program Asst. (PH. 608-266-3561)  
(E-Mail: mike.barman@legis.state.wi.us) (FAX: 608-264-6948)

State of Wisconsin  
Legislative Reference Bureau - Legal Section - Front Office  
100 N. Hamilton Street - 5th Floor  
Madison, WI 53703

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Hanaman, Cathlene  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 03, 2003 12:00 PM  
**To:** Barman, Mike  
**Subject:** That fiscal

The person completing it should just add the ***\$\$ amount*** to any line and maybe add an asterisk; then the person should explain the caveat in the narrative.

Or should could add to the narrative an instruction to see an attachment. Then she could create an attachment explaining the need for the ***\$\$ amount***.

I ran these suggestions by DOA and received approval.

## Barman, Mike

---

**From:** Kind, Donna  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 05, 2003 11:23 AM  
**To:** Barman, Mike; Schaeffer, Carole  
**Subject:** RE: DOT's fiscal estimate on (un-introduced) LRB 03-2446/2

Dennis Leong (the preparer) called me Tuesday afternoon. He did not understand why he was getting a worksheet error when he tried to send the fiscal estimate to the approver. I explained that the system was looking for the dollar amounts in section A to equal the dollar amounts in section B. He then entered some additional numbers and was able to send the estimate to the approver. He seemed satisfied at the time, but perhaps the approver doesn't think the worksheet is quite right since it is still at the approver stage. If that's the case, I think you came up with a good solution Mike. They could send the worksheet as an attachment.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Barman, Mike  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 05, 2003 11:11 AM  
**To:** Schaeffer, Carole  
**Cc:** Kind, Donna  
**Subject:** DOT's fiscal estimate on (un-introduced) LRB 03-2446/2

Carole -

Did DOT ever get the problems with the Worksheet on the fiscal estimate for LRB 03-2446/2 resolved. I see it still has not been submitted. I have been thinking ... since the FES would reject the worksheet whenever they tried to send the fiscal estimate on to the approver stage .... perhaps after completing the worksheet (before sending the fiscal on to be approved) they could:

- 1) print out a copy of the competed worksheet ...
- 2) scan/save the worksheet as a PDF ...
- 3) use the "attachment" feature in the FES to link the scanned worksheet to the fiscal estimate as an separate (PDF) attachment ...
- 4) then they could go back a few steps in the FES, deselect the need for a worksheet, leaving just the "Cover" page and the "Narratives" page(s) with their "Assumptions" and "Long-Range Implications."

The "worksheet" would then be an separate attachment instead of being included in the "link" with the rest of the fiscal estimate. What do you think?

*Mike Barman*

Mike Barman - Senior Program Asst. (PH. 608-266-3561)  
(E-Mail: [mike.barmann@legis.state.wi.us](mailto:mike.barmann@legis.state.wi.us)) (FAX: 608-264-6948)

State of Wisconsin  
Legislative Reference Bureau - Legal Section - Front Office  
100 N. Hamilton Street - 5th Floor  
Madison, WI 53703

# Memo

To: Senator ☐ Representative

**X Schooff**

(The Draft's Requester)

Per your request: ... the attached fiscal estimate was prepared for your unIntroduced 2003 draft.

LRB Number: LRB **- 2446**

Version: **" / 2 "**

Fiscal Estimate Prepared By: (agency abbr.) **DOT**

If you have questions about the enclosed fiscal estimate, you may contact the state agency representative that prepared the fiscal estimate. If you disagree with the enclosed fiscal estimate, please contact the LRB drafter of your proposal to discuss your options under the fiscal estimate procedure.

Entered In Computer And Copy Sent To Requester Via E-Mail: **06 / 12 / 2003**

**\* \* \* \* \***

To: LRB – Legal Section PA's

Subject: *Fiscal Estimate Received For An Unintroduced Draft*

> **If redrafted** ... please insert this cover sheet and attached early fiscal estimate into the drafting file ... after the draft's old version (the version that this fiscal estimate was based on), and before the markup of the draft on the updated version.

> **If introduced** ... and the version of the attached fiscal estimate is for a **previous version** ... please insert this cover sheet and attached early fiscal estimate into the drafting file ... after the draft's old version (the version that this fiscal estimate was based on), and before the markup of the draft on the updated version. Have Mike (or Lynn) get the ball rolling on getting a fiscal estimate prepared for the introduced version.

> **If introduced** ... and the version of the attached fiscal estimate is for the **current version** ... please write the draft's introduction number below and give to Mike (or Lynn) to process.

THIS DRAFT WAS INTRODUCED AS: 2003 \_\_\_\_\_

## Barman, Mike

---

**From:** Barman, Mike  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 12, 2003 9:25 AM  
**To:** Rep.Schooff  
**Cc:** Pozdol, Angela  
**Subject:** LRB 03-2446/2 (FE by DOT-attached-for your review)



FE\_Schooff.pdf

## Fiscal Estimate - 2003 Session

☒ Original      ☐ Updated      ☐ Corrected      ☐ Supplemental

<b>LRB Number</b> <b>03-2446/2</b>		<b>Introduction Number</b>	
<b>Subject</b>  Historic buildings and downtown development			
<b>Fiscal Effect</b>  <b>State:</b> <div style="display: flex; flex-wrap: wrap;"><div style="width: 50%;"><input type="checkbox"/> No State Fiscal Effect <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate     <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Appropriations     <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Appropriations     <input type="checkbox"/> Create New Appropriations</div><div style="width: 50%;"><input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs - May be possible to absorb within agency's budget                     <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes                      <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs</div></div> <b>Local:</b> <div style="display: flex; flex-wrap: wrap;"><div style="width: 50%;"><input type="checkbox"/> No Local Government Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate     1. <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs                      3. <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Revenue         <input type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory      <input type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory     2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs                    4. <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Revenue         <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory      <input type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory</div><div style="width: 50%;"><b>5. Types of Local Government Units Affected</b> <div style="display: flex; flex-wrap: wrap;"><div style="width: 50%;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Towns      <input type="checkbox"/> Counties      <input type="checkbox"/> School Districts</div><div style="width: 50%;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Village      <input type="checkbox"/> Others      <input type="checkbox"/> WTCS Districts</div><div style="width: 50%;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cities</div></div></div></div>			

Re-Written

Fiscal Estimate Narratives  
DOT 6/12/2003

Re-Written

LRB Number 03-2446/2	Introduction Number	Estimate Type	Original
<b>Subject</b>			
Historic buildings and downtown development			

**Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate**

Downtown Development: Fiscal Impacts

Assumptions

1. This Bill requires DOT to consult with State Main Street communities and other certified downtowns recognized by the Department of Commerce when a highway improvement project will have an impact on the downtown area. DOT must give priority to retaining the on-street parking when a highway project widens the streets for through traffic in the downtown area.

(Assumption: The public outreach requirement for the DOT to contact communities impacted by construction of highway projects in the downtown area will not likely result in additional hours or costs on the District staff. As a matter of practice, District project managers and their contractors meet regularly with local officials and residents in advance of upcoming transportation projects. District staff help the local communities develop and provide alternative access to downtown businesses. Discussions and actions are taken to mitigate project impacts to the communities. Discussions and negotiations regarding the retention of on-street parking can be included in these pre-project District outreach meetings.)

2. This Bill requires DOT to pay for the resurfacing and rehabilitation of parking lanes when the Department is making improvements to the travel lanes for Main Street and certified communities under the Department of Commerce.

(Assumption: There are currently 24 out of 34 Main Street communities in the Department of Commerce program that have state highways passing through the central business districts. In the Department's Six-Year Highway Improvement Plan (2002-2007), it is estimated that 10 Main Street communities could have construction projects in the downtown area. The Department of Commerce estimated another six downtown business districts that might seek certification within the next 2-6 years. This certification process would qualify these six (or more) communities for parking lane resurfacing or reconstruction costs from DOT. The parking lanes associated with the boundaries of the main street business district along a state highway varies between 8-14 blocks in length.)

Fiscal impact analysis is based on the following two scenarios:

A. Assuming 10 Main Street communities and 6 additional certified business districts qualify for resurfacing and reconstruction for 8 blocks of parking lanes for years 2002-2007.

Resurfacing (asphalt) for 16 downtown districts @ 8 blocks per district =  
\$704,000

Reconstruct (asphalt) 16 downtown districts @ 8 blocks per district =  
\$985,600

Reconstruct (concrete) 16 downtown districts @ 8 blocks per district = \$1,267,200

B. Assuming 10 Main Street communities and 6 additional certified business districts qualify for resurfacing and reconstruction for 14 blocks of parking lanes for years 2002-2007.

Resurfacing (asphalt) for 16 downtown districts @ 14 blocks per district = \$1,078,000

Reconstruct (asphalt) 16 downtown districts @ 14 blocks per district =  
\$1,509,200

Reconstruct (concrete) 16 downtown districts @ 14 blocks per district =  
\$1,940,400

Re-Written

\*NOTE: Under current law, if a community wants parallel parking along the marked route of a State Trunk Highway within their municipal boundaries; the municipality must pay for the parking per State Statute 86.32 (4) and agree to maintain those parking lanes. Under this bill, DOT pays for parking lanes for the Main Street and certified business district status, but not for parking lanes on other connecting highways. A "connecting highway" is a marked route of a State Trunk Highway on a street or highway in a municipality designated as a connecting highway under State Statute 86.32(1).

3. The Bill requires the DOT to design and construct an "active bypass" for any of the current six highway majors bypass projects when the local governing body of a city, village, or town adopts a resolution requesting such an action. "Active bypass" is defined in the Bill as a bypass of an existing highway that is designed and constructed so that access to the bypass requires motorists to exit the existing highway in order to travel on the bypass. The following six highway major bypasses currently listed in the program are: Beloit, Burlington, Eau Claire, Fond du Lac, Oconomowoc and Whitewater. DOT highway design engineers have recommended a type of directional intersection or interchange to safely accomplish the intent of an "active bypass".

(Assumptions: The design was based on the concept of a directional split, similar to the interchange in Tomah where I-90 and I-94 splits into two interstate highways. This scenario gives the drivers time to make a decision to merge into the lanes that would either take them into the community or choose the route that would bypass the community. This scenario may require more right-of-way in order to construct the additional lanes, transitional lanes, and additional signage needed to inform drivers well in advance of the directional split. DOT estimated the cost for an "active" bypass to be \$5.5 million.)

There are six bypasses in the current majors program, resulting in a total estimated increased cost of \$33 million.

Cost breakdown for an "active" bypass includes:

- Two miles of additional lanes approaching the directional splits \$4 million
- Two 1800' of transitional lanes from the directional split into the municipality \$0.5 million
- Additional design, public meetings, right-of-way, signage, Environmental Impact Statements, etc. - \$1 million
- Access spacing between interchanges/intersection may be altered (unknown)

TOTAL (Per Bypass) \$5.5 million 6 "Active Bypasses" = \$33 million

Total Reconstruction (concrete) parking lanes = \$1,940,400

Grand Total = \$34,940,400

Assuming increased costs spread evenly over 6 years = annualized increased of \$5,824,000

## Long-Range Fiscal Implications

### Long-Range Fiscal Implications

The Bill authorizes the Department of Commerce to certify downtown business districts. Upon certification, these business districts will be qualified to receive DOT assistance to resurface and reconstruct parking lanes. The long-range fiscal implications are based upon how many of these business districts will become certified in the future. It is possible that every community where a highway project runs through the downtown business district will ask to be certified and thus qualify for parking lane improvements. This will likely add 2-3 times the number of communities that will be eligible for parking lane improvements in the next six-year highway improvement plan. Estimated impact for the next Six-Year Highway Improvement Plan

(2008-2014) ranges between \$2-6 million

Re-Written

## Fiscal Estimate Worksheet - 2003 Session

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect

Re-Written

☒ Original
 ☐ Updated
 ☐ Corrected
 ☐ Supplemental

<b>LRB Number</b> 03-2446/2		<b>Introduction Number</b>	
<b>Subject</b>			
Historic buildings and downtown development			
<b>I. One-time Costs or Revenue Impacts for State and/or Local Government (do not include in annualized fiscal effect):</b>			
\$34,940,000 increased costs to state over 6 year program period annualized per below.			
<b>II. Annualized Costs:</b>		<b>Annualized Fiscal Impact on funds from:</b>	
		Increased Costs	Decreased Costs
<b>A. State Costs by Category</b>			
State Operations - Salaries and Fringes		\$	
(FTE Position Changes)			
State Operations - Other Costs	5,824,000		
Local Assistance			
Aids to Individuals or Organizations			
<b>TOTAL State Costs by Category</b>	<b>\$5,824,000</b>		<b>\$</b>
<b>B. State Costs by Source of Funds</b>			
GPR			
FED	4,659,000		
PRO/PRS	1,165,000		
SEG/SEG-S			
<b>III. State Revenues - Complete this only when proposal will increase or decrease state revenues (e.g., tax increase, decrease in license fee, etc.)</b>			
	Increased Rev	Decreased Rev	
GPR Taxes	\$	\$	
GPR Earned			
FED			
PRO/PRS			
SEG/SEG-S			
<b>TOTAL State Revenues</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	
<b>NET ANNUALIZED FISCAL IMPACT</b>			
	State	Local	
NET CHANGE IN COSTS	\$5,824,000	\$-323,000	
NET CHANGE IN REVENUE	\$	\$	
<b>Agency/Prepared By</b>		<b>Authorized Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
DOT/ Dennis Leong (608) 266-9910		Carol Buckmaster (608) 267-6979	6/12/2003

## Barman, Mike

---

**From:** Barman, Mike  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 03, 2003 11:08 AM  
**To:** Rep.Schooff; Pozdol, Angela  
**Subject:** FE by DOT LRB 03-2446/2

*Angela -*

*Per your request ... the "original" fiscal estimate we sent you (06/12/2003) on LRB 03-2446/2 by DOT (dated: 06/12/2003) is going to be re-written (see below). The earlier fiscal estimate will remain a part of the "Drafting File" but will not be released (introduced) when the bill is introduced. DOT should soon replace this fiscal estimate with a new "original" fiscal estimate. Let me know if you have any questions.*

*Mike Barman*

Mike Barman - Senior Program Asst. (PH. 608-266-3561)  
(E-Mail: mike.barman@legis.state.wi.us) (FAX: 608-264-6948)

State of Wisconsin  
Legislative Reference Bureau - Legal Section - Front Office  
100 N. Hamilton Street - 5th Floor  
Madison, WI 53703

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Buckmaster, Carol  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 03, 2003 10:26 AM  
**To:** Barman, Mike  
**Subject:** RE: LRB 03-2466

Yes

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Barman, Mike  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 03, 2003 10:17 AM  
**To:** Buckmaster, Carol; Schaeffer, Carole  
**Cc:** Klein, Rose; Maassen, Joe; Leong, Dennis  
**Subject:** RE: LRB 03-2466

**Do you mean LRB-2446/2 ???**

*Mike Barman*

Mike Barman - Senior Program Asst. (PH. 608-266-3561)  
(E-Mail: mike.barman@legis.state.wi.us) (FAX: 608-264-6948)

State of Wisconsin  
Legislative Reference Bureau - Legal Section - Front Office  
100 N. Hamilton Street - 5th Floor  
Madison, WI 53703

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Buckmaster, Carol  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 03, 2003 9:30 AM  
**To:** Schaeffer, Carole; Barman, Mike  
**Cc:** Klein, Rose; Maassen, Joe; Leong, Dennis  
**Subject:** LRB 03-2466

This EMail serves as notification that DOT will authorize a "new original" fiscal estimate on the above LRB draft. It is our understanding that Rep. Schooff's office has contacted the author of the fiscal estimate, Dennis Leong, regarding the fiscal estimate. Miscommunication surrounding "normal

interchange" is the issue and Dennis has agreed to redo it.

Please begin the fiscal estimate process for a new original fiscal estimate on LRB 2466. Thank you.

# Memo

To: Senator ☐ Representative ☒

**X Schooff**

(The Draft's Requester)

Per your request: ... the attached fiscal estimate was prepared for your unIntroduced 2003 draft.

LRB Number: LRB **- 2446**

Version: **" / 2 "**

Fiscal Estimate Prepared By: (agency abbr.) **SHS**

If you have questions about the enclosed fiscal estimate, you may contact the state agency representative that prepared the fiscal estimate. If you disagree with the enclosed fiscal estimate, please contact the LRB drafter of your proposal to discuss your options under the fiscal estimate procedure.

Entered In Computer And Copy Sent To Requester Via E-Mail: **05 / 14 / 2003**

\* \* \* \* \*

To: LRB – Legal Section PA's

Subject: *Fiscal Estimate Received For An Unintroduced Draft*

> **If redrafted** ... please insert this cover sheet and attached early fiscal estimate into the drafting file ... after the draft's old version (the version that this fiscal estimate was based on), and before the markup of the draft on the updated version.

> **If introduced** ... and the version of the attached fiscal estimate is for a **previous version** ... please insert this cover sheet and attached early fiscal estimate into the drafting file ... after the draft's old version (the version that this fiscal estimate was based on), and before the markup of the draft on the updated version. Have Mike (or Lynn) get the ball rolling on getting a fiscal estimate prepared for the introduced version.

> **If introduced** ... and the version of the attached fiscal estimate is for the **current version** ... please write the draft's introduction number below and give to Mike (or Lynn) to process.

THIS DRAFT WAS INTRODUCED AS: 2003 **AB-499**

**Barman, Mike**

---

**From:** Barman, Mike  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 14, 2003 9:23 AM  
**To:** Rep.Schooff  
**Subject:** LRB 03-2446/2 (FE by SHS - attached - for your review)



FE\_Schooff.pdf

# Memo

To: Senator ☐

Representative

**X Schooff**

(The Draft's Requester)

Per your request: ... the attached fiscal estimate was prepared for your unIntroduced 2003 draft.

LRB Number: LRB

**- 2446**

Version: **" / 2 "**

Fiscal Estimate Prepared By: (agency abbr.)

**COMM**

If you have questions about the enclosed fiscal estimate, you may contact the state agency representative that prepared the fiscal estimate. If you disagree with the enclosed fiscal estimate, please contact the LRB drafter of your proposal to discuss your options under the fiscal estimate procedure.

Entered In Computer And Copy Sent To Requester Via E-Mail:

**05 / 19 / 2003**

\* \* \* \* \*

To: LRB – Legal Section PA's

Subject:

*Fiscal Estimate Received For An Unintroduced Draft*

> **If redrafted** ... please insert this cover sheet and attached early fiscal estimate into the drafting file ... after the draft's old version (the version that this fiscal estimate was based on), and before the markup of the draft on the updated version.

> **If introduced** ... and the version of the attached fiscal estimate is for a **previous version** ... please insert this cover sheet and attached early fiscal estimate into the drafting file ... after the draft's old version (the version that this fiscal estimate was based on), and before the markup of the draft on the updated version. Have Mike (or Lynn) get the ball rolling on getting a fiscal estimate prepared for the introduced version.

> **If introduced** ... and the version of the attached fiscal estimate is for the **current version** ... please write the draft's introduction number below and give to Mike (or Lynn) to process.

THIS DRAFT WAS INTRODUCED AS: 2003

**AB-499**

## Barman, Mike

---

**From:** Barman, Mike  
**Sent:** Monday, May 19, 2003 1:38 PM  
**To:** Rep.Schooff  
**Cc:** Pozdol, Angela  
**Subject:** LRB 03-2446/2 (FE by COMM - attached - for your review)



FE-Schooff.pdf

# Memo

To: Senator ☐

Representative

**X Schooff**

(The Draft's Requester)

Per your request: ... the attached fiscal estimate was prepared for your unIntroduced 2003 draft.

LRB Number: LRB **- 2446**

Version: **" / 2 "**

Fiscal Estimate Prepared By: (agency abbr.) **DOA**

If you have questions about the enclosed fiscal estimate, you may contact the state agency representative that prepared the fiscal estimate. If you disagree with the enclosed fiscal estimate, please contact the LRB drafter of your proposal to discuss your options under the fiscal estimate procedure.

Entered In Computer And Copy Sent To Requester Via E-Mail: **05 / 30 / 2003**

**\* \* \* \* \***

To: LRB – Legal Section PA's

Subject: *Fiscal Estimate Received For An Unintroduced Draft*

> **If redrafted** ... please insert this cover sheet and attached early fiscal estimate into the drafting file ... after the draft's old version (the version that this fiscal estimate was based on), and before the markup of the draft on the updated version.

> **If introduced** ... and the version of the attached fiscal estimate is for a **previous version** ... please insert this cover sheet and attached early fiscal estimate into the drafting file ... after the draft's old version (the version that this fiscal estimate was based on), and before the markup of the draft on the updated version. Have Mike (or Lynn) get the ball rolling on getting a fiscal estimate prepared for the introduced version.

> **If introduced** ... and the version of the attached fiscal estimate is for the **current version** ... please write the draft's introduction number below and give to Mike (or Lynn) to process.

THIS DRAFT WAS INTRODUCED AS: 2003 **AB-499**

## **Barman, Mike**

---

**From:** Barman, Mike  
**Sent:** Friday, May 30, 2003 12:15 PM  
**To:** Rep.Schooff  
**Cc:** Pozdol, Angela  
**Subject:** LRB 03-2446/2 (FE by DOA - attached - for your review)



FE\_Schooff.pdf

**Barman, Mike**

---

**From:** Emery, Lynn  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 16, 2003 3:28 PM  
**To:** Barman, Mike  
**Subject:** Fiscal that is sitting on your desk

Someone from Rep. Schooff's office called about the fiscal estimate on AB-499 by DOT. They have a problem with it. They contacted DOT and Carol S. and they are going to rewrite the original. I wasn't sure if I was suppose to do anything with it or enter something into the FE website so I left it for you! Apparently there is a hearing on the bill next Wednesday (the 24th.)

Lynn Emery  
Program Assistant  
Legislative Reference Bureau  
608-266-3561  
lynn.emery@legis.state.wi.us

## Barman, Mike

---

**From:** Barman, Mike  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 17, 2003 9:36 AM  
**To:** Buckmaster, Carol  
**Cc:** Schaeffer, Carole  
**Subject:** RE: AB 499

**Importance:** High

*I will return your FE on AB-499 (dated 09/15/2003 - it has not been released) ... DOA will in turn return it to you so you can re-write (re-submit) a new "original" fiscal estimate for AB-499.*

*Mike Barman*

Mike Barman - Senior Program Asst. (PH. 608-266-3561)  
(E-Mail: [mike.barman@legis.state.wi.us](mailto:mike.barman@legis.state.wi.us)) (FAX: 608-264-6948)

State of Wisconsin  
Legislative Reference Bureau - Legal Section - Front Office  
100 N. Hamilton Street - 5th Floor  
Madison, WI 53703

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Buckmaster, Carol  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 17, 2003 9:28 AM  
**To:** Barman, Mike  
**Subject:** AB 499  
**Importance:** High

Mike - please release the fiscal estimate for AB 499. WisDOT needs to make corrections to this fiscal estimate. Will this be considered a corrected fiscal estimate or original since my understanding is the fiscal estimate I forwarded 9/15 has not been released.

LRB

## Fiscal Estimate - 2003 Session

☒ Original      ☐ Updated      ☐ Corrected      ☐ Supplemental

<b>LRB Number</b> 03-2446/2		<b>Introduction Number</b> AB-499	
<b>Subject</b> Historic buildings and downtown development			
<b>Fiscal Effect</b>  <b>State:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> No State Fiscal Effect <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Appropriations <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Appropriations <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Create New Appropriations  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs - May be possible to absorb within agency's budget <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs  <b>Local:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> No Local Government Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs      3. <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Revenue <input type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory <input type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory 2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs      4. <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Revenue <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory  5. Types of Local Government Units Affected <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Towns <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Village <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cities <input type="checkbox"/> Counties <input type="checkbox"/> Others <input type="checkbox"/> School Districts <input type="checkbox"/> WTCS Districts			
<b>Fund Sources Affected</b> <input type="checkbox"/> GPR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FED <input type="checkbox"/> PRO <input type="checkbox"/> PRS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEG <input type="checkbox"/> SEGS Ch. 84 and Ch. 20		<b>Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations</b>	
<b>Agency/Prepared By</b> DOT/ Dennis Leong (608) 266-9910		<b>Authorized Signature</b> Carol Buckmaster (608) 267-6979	
		<b>Date</b> 9/15/2003	

never released → will be re-written

## Fiscal Estimate Narratives

DOT 9/16/2003

LRB Number	03-2446/2	Introduction Number	AB-499	Estimate Type	Original
<b>Subject</b>					
Historic buildings and downtown development					

### Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

Downtown Development: Fiscal Impacts

#### Assumptions

1. This Bill requires DOT to consult with State Main Street communities and other certified downtowns recognized by the Department of Commerce when a highway improvement project will have an impact on the downtown area. DOT must give priority to retaining the on-street parking when a highway project widens the streets for through traffic in the downtown area.

(Assumption: The public outreach requirement for the DOT to contact communities impacted by construction of highway projects in the downtown area will not likely result in additional hours or costs on the District staff. As a matter of practice, District project managers and their contractors meet regularly with local officials and residents in advance of upcoming transportation projects. District staff help the local communities develop and provide alternative access to downtown businesses. Discussions and actions are taken to mitigate project impacts to the communities. Discussions and negotiations regarding the retention of on-street parking can be included in these pre-project District outreach meetings.)

2. This Bill requires DOT to pay for the resurfacing and rehabilitation of parking lanes when the Department is making improvements to the travel lanes for Main Street and certified communities under the Department of Commerce.

(Assumption: There are currently 24 out of 34 Main Street communities in the Department of Commerce program that have state highways passing through the central business districts. In the Department's Six-Year Highway Improvement Plan (2002-2007), it is estimated that 10 Main Street communities could have construction projects in the downtown area. The Department of Commerce estimated another six downtown business districts that might seek certification within the next 2-6 years. This certification process would qualify these six (or more) communities for parking lane resurfacing or reconstruction costs from DOT. The parking lanes associated with the boundaries of the main street business district along a state highway varies between 8-14 blocks in length.)

Fiscal impact analysis is based on the following two scenarios:

A. Assuming 10 Main Street communities and 6 additional certified business districts qualify for resurfacing and reconstruction for 8 blocks of parking lanes for years 2002-2007.

Resurfacing (asphalt) for 16 downtown districts @ 8 blocks per district =  
\$704,000

Reconstruct (asphalt) 16 downtown districts @ 8 blocks per district =  
\$985,600

Reconstruct (concrete) 16 downtown districts @ 8 blocks per district = \$1,267,200

B. Assuming 10 Main Street communities and 6 additional certified business districts qualify for resurfacing and reconstruction for 14 blocks of parking lanes for years 2002-2007.

Resurfacing (asphalt) for 16 downtown districts @ 14 blocks per district = \$1,078,000

Reconstruct (asphalt) 16 downtown districts @ 14 blocks per district =  
\$1,509,200

Reconstruct (concrete) 16 downtown districts @ 14 blocks per district =  
\$1,940,400

\*NOTE: Under current law, if a community wants parallel parking along the marked route of a State Trunk Highway within their municipal boundaries; the municipality must pay for the parking per State Statute 86.32(4) and agree to maintain those parking lanes. Under this bill, DOT pays for parking lanes for the Main Street and certified business district status, but not for parking lanes on other connecting highways. A "connecting highway" is a marked route of a State Trunk Highway on a street or highway in a municipality designated as a connecting highway under State Statute 86.32(1).

3. The Bill requires the DOT to design and construct an "active bypass" for any of the current six highway majors bypass projects when the local governing body of a city, village, or town adopts a resolution requesting such an action. "Active bypass" is defined in the Bill as a bypass of an existing highway that is designed and constructed so that access to the bypass requires motorists to exit the existing highway in order to travel on the bypass. DOT highway design engineers have recommended a type of directional intersection or interchange to safely accomplish the intent of an "active bypass".

(Assumptions: The design was based on the concept of a directional split, similar to the interchange in Tomah where I-90 and I-94 splits into two interstate highways. This scenario gives the drivers time to make a decision to merge into the lanes that would either take them into the community or choose the route that would bypass the community. This scenario may require more right-of-way in order to construct the additional lanes, transitional lanes, and additional signage needed to inform drivers well in advance of the directional split. In order to maintain driver expectancy and consistency, that is, keeping the through lanes on the left and lanes leaving the main roadway to the right, it would be necessary to construct three bridges or structures for the two active bypasses at each end of the bypassed community.

Directional Split or Major Fork at both ends of the community \$11,083,335  
(includes three bridges to accommodate right exits from the main highway in order to address driver expectancy concerns)

Regular diamond interchanges at both ends of the community \$ 8,680,392

Cost difference between active and regular bypass interchanges \$ 2,402,943

It cost at least \$2.4 million more to construct an active bypass provided that no other improvement is considered under this scenario. It is possible that an active bypass may have additional interchanges to allow for additional access from the highway which add back the cost for interchanges. For the purposes of this analysis, the additional cost impact per year may be \$2.4 million per bypass community if the DOT would to construct one new active bypass per year.

### **Long-Range Fiscal Implications**

#### **Long-Range Fiscal Implications**

The Bill authorizes the Department of Commerce to certify downtown business districts. Upon certification, these business districts will be qualified to receive DOT assistance to resurface and reconstruct parking lanes. The long-range fiscal implications are based upon how many of these business districts will become certified in the future. It is possible that every community where a highway project runs through the downtown business district will ask to be certified and thus qualify for parking lane improvements. This will likely add 2-3 times the number of communities that will be eligible for parking lane improvements in the next six-year highway improvement plan. Estimated impact for the next Six-Year Highway Improvement Plan (2008-2014) ranges between \$2-6 million

## Fiscal Estimate Worksheet - 2003 Session

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect



Original



Updated



Corrected



Supplemental

<b>LRB Number</b> 03-2446/2	<b>Introduction Number</b> AB-499
<b>Subject</b>	
Historic buildings and downtown development	
<b>I. One-time Costs or Revenue Impacts for State and/or Local Government (do not include in annualized fiscal effect):</b>	
\$2-6 million increased costs to state over 6 year program period (average \$1 million per year) for parking lanes and \$2.4 million per year for the design and construction of one active bypass per year.	
<b>II. Annualized Costs:</b>	<b>Annualized Fiscal Impact on funds from:</b>
	Increased Costs      Decreased Costs
<b>A. State Costs by Category</b>	
State Operations - Salaries and Fringes	\$
(FTE Position Changes)	
State Operations - Other Costs	3,400,000
Local Assistance	
Aids to Individuals or Organizations	
<b>TOTAL State Costs by Category</b>	<b>\$3,400,000</b> \$
<b>B. State Costs by Source of Funds</b>	
GPR	
FED	2,720,000
PRO/PRS	680,000
SEG/SEG-S	
<b>III. State Revenues - Complete this only when proposal will increase or decrease state revenues (e.g., tax increase, decrease in license fee, etc.)</b>	
	Increased Rev      Decreased Rev
GPR Taxes	\$      \$
GPR Earned	
FED	
PRO/PRS	
SEG/SEG-S	
<b>TOTAL State Revenues</b>	<b>\$      \$</b>
<b>NET ANNUALIZED FISCAL IMPACT</b>	
	State      Local
NET CHANGE IN COSTS	\$3,400,000      \$-200,000
NET CHANGE IN REVENUE	\$      \$
<b>Agency/Prepared By</b>	
DOT/ Dennis Leong (608) 266-9910	<b>Authorized Signature</b>
	Carol Buckmaster (608) 267-6979
	<b>Date</b>
	9/15/2003



# State of Wisconsin

## LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

100 NORTH HAMILTON STREET  
P. O. BOX 2037  
MADISON, WI 53701-2037

LEGAL SECTION: (608) 266-3561  
REFERENCE SECTION: (608) 266-0341  
FAX: (608) 266-5648

STEPHEN R. MILLER  
CHIEF

LRB

October 21, 2003

## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Representative Schooff

**From:** Joseph T. Kreye, Legislative Attorney, (608) 266-2263  
Robert J. Marchant, Legislative Attorney, (608) 261-4454  
Marc E. Shovers, Sr. Legislative Attorney, (608) 266-0129

**Subject:** Technical Memorandum to **2003 AB 499** (LRB-2446/2)

---

We received the attached technical memorandum relating to your bill. This copy is for your information and your file. If you wish to discuss this memorandum or the necessity of revising your bill or preparing an amendment, please contact me.

LRB

## MEMORANDUM

October 6, 2003

**TO:** Joseph Kreye  
Robert Marchant  
Marc Shovers  
Legislative Reference Bureau

**FROM:** Dennis Collier  
Department of Revenue

**SUBJECT:** Technical Memorandum on AB 499: Historic Buildings and Downtown Development

The Department has the following comments regarding AB 499. Comments regarding assembly amendment 1 follow the comments on the original bill.

### **Supplement to Federal Rehabilitation Credit**

Under the bill, an owner of a historic building who is not a Wisconsin resident and who is not required to file a Wisconsin return may enter into an agreement with another person to allow the other person to claim the credit. There are a number of problems with this provision as drafted.

- (1) It is unclear if "nonresident" refers only to a natural person, or also to pass-through entities and corporations. If it applies to pass-through entities and corporations, it is unclear how nonresident status is determined. It could be based on the state in which the entity was organized or incorporated, or where the entity's commercial domicile is located. If it is based on commercial domicile, then "commercial domicile" must be defined.
- (2) The statutory language does not provide guidance as to which person is to be assessed if the credit were incorrectly computed or if the credit would have to be repaid if the property were sold within five years.
- (3) If a person can transfer tax credits to another person, it appears that the provision for paying back the credit under certain conditions will not apply because the person who claimed the credit may not be the person who sold the property prior to five years or otherwise altered the property so that it no longer qualifies for the credit.

### **State Credit for Owner-Occupied Personal Residence**

The order of computation of the state rehabilitation credit in sec. 71.10(4)(fm) allows the credit to be offset against the alternative minimum tax. However, the language in sec. 71.07(9r)(a)1 and 2 provides that the credit may be "claimed against taxes due under s. 71.02." This should be changed to allow the credit against either "taxes due under s. 71.02 and 71.08" or taxes due under Chapter 71. Because the credit is claimed after the alternative minimum tax, it should be included in the list of credits in sec. 71.08(1)(a). If the credit is not listed, the alternative minimum tax cannot be computed until the amount of the credit is known, and the amount of the credit that can be claimed cannot be determined until the minimum tax is known.

An issue that has never been addressed with respect to the credit for an owner-occupied residence is when the credit can be claimed. When the original law was passed, proponents indicated that they wanted taxpayers to be able to claim the credit on an annual basis, using the expenses paid during that taxable year. (If the taxpayer never reached the minimum amount of expenditures, he or she would have to repay any credits received.) However, another reading of the statutes is that the credit must be claimed in the year that the project is completed. Since the credit program is being expanded, it would be helpful to clarify when the credit should be claimed.

### **Assembly Amendment 1**

The reference to sec. 71.02 on page 2, line 20 of the amendment should be changed to sec. 71.23. Similarly, the reference on page 3, line 16 should be changed to sec. 71.43.

The proposed legislation makes no provision for the funding of the costs involved in administering the activities required. The Department estimates one-time costs for developing forms and programming and annual ongoing costs to administer the changes as shown below. If the author wishes to provide funding, appropriation language could be developed and costs allocated in the following manner:

	Chapter 20	Amount
one-time	s. 20.566 (1) (a)	\$62,500
annual	s. 20.566 (1) (a)	\$2,800

If you have any questions regarding this technical memorandum, please contact Pam Walgren at your 266-7817.